

Remarks/Arguments

Claim 1 has been amended. No new claims have been added. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1-8 remain pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claims 1-8

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stedman et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,081,837, in view of *Imai et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,148,334. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

The present invention provides a data structure embodied in a computer-readable storage medium, said data structure representing information describing a file system connection between a local file system located on a local system and a host file system located on a host system, wherein said data structure comprises a file system connection descriptor, said file system connection descriptor comprising: a local system data structure representing the local file system; a host system data structure representing the host file system; and a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the local file system and the host file system.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner argues that the combination of *Stedman et al.* (column 19, lines 53-67 and column 20, lines 1-25) and *Imai et al.* (column 7, lines 3-20 and column 24,

lines 8-44) teaches the file system connection descriptor of the present invention. However, *Stedman et al.* (column 19, lines 53-67 and column 20, lines 1-25) teaches a session ID which is a communication session descriptor or a communication session connection descriptor, but definitely not a file system connection descriptor. The session ID is merely a unique identifier of a particular communication session between a local system and a host system. The session ID is not a file system connection descriptor as the session ID is not a local system data structure representing the local file system. Furthermore, the session ID is not a file system connection descriptor as the session ID is not a host system data structure representing the host file system. Finally, the session ID is not a file system connection descriptor as the session ID is not a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the local file system and the host file system.

In particular, relative to the session ID which identifies a communications link, *Stedman et al.* teaches:

“The RUMBA® connectivity software, developed by Wall Data Incorporated, is a computer program that establishes a communications link between a PC and a host computer. The RUMBA software allows the user of a PC to connect to a host computer in order to view stored data and enter new data. RUMBA provides a window on the PC within which an operator can access and manipulate data from a host computer. The communications link and window are referred to as a RUMBA session.” (column 1, lines 37-45)

“The invention also provides for multiple communication sessions, each communication session having one browser application, one host extension object, one Display control, and one host computer. A session ID is associated with each communication session. The session ID is inserted in the Hypertext Link Addresses that are sent from the server computer to the client computer. When the server computer receives a Hypertext Link Address from the client computer, the session ID is extracted and used to identify the particular host extension that corresponds to the originating browser application. The command is then forwarded to the particular corresponding host extension.” (column 3, lines 38-49)

Imai et al. also fails to teach the file system connection descriptor of the present invention. Although *Imai et al.* teaches a network connection which may be used for a file transfer, and although *Imai et al.* teaches a list of files to be transferred from a host or server, *Imai et al.* fails to teach the file system connection descriptor of the present invention. The list of files to transfer is not a file system connection descriptor as the list of files to transfer is not a local system data structure representing the local file system. Furthermore, the list of files to transfer is not a file system connection descriptor as the list of files to transfer is not a mapping data structure representing a mapping between the local file system and the host file system.

In particular, relative to the network connection and list of files to transfer, *Imai et al.* teaches:

“The file requesting client 120 includes a connection unit 131 for setting up a connection with the file server 110, a file request unit 132 for requesting a file to the file server 110, a file receiving unit 133 for receiving a file requested from the file request unit 132, a file storing unit 134 for storing a file received by the file receiving unit 133 into a storage medium, a file display unit 135 for displaying a file requested by a user, a request handling unit 136 for handling requests from the user, and a disconnection unit 137 for carrying out a processing to finish a communication with the file server 110 and disconnect a network connection.” (column 7, lines 4-14)

“In the file requesting client 120, the connection unit 131 carries out a processing for enabling the communication by HTTP with the file server 110 which is connected at the communication device 127 such as a modem or an infrared interface. Then, a menu transmitted from the file server 110 in response to a menu request from the file requesting client 120 is received at the file receiving unit 133. When a file is selected from the menu by the user and a user's request is entered, this request is handled at the request handling unit 136. The file request unit 132 then transmits a file request 140 according to this handled request. ” (column 7, lines 34-44)

“When a file corresponding to the file request 140 from the file request unit 132 is transmitted from the file server 110, this file is received at the file receiving unit 133. This received file is then stored into the cache region 121a of the storage medium 121 by the file storing unit 134. In addition, when an information received at the file receiving

unit 133 is a file requested by the user, this file is displayed by the file display unit 135.”

(column 7, lines 51-56)

“After the connection processing between the file server 110 and the file requesting client 120 is completed, the file requesting client 120 is now connected with the file server 110 by the HTTP, and a menu which is a list of files that can be provided by the file server 110 is requested by a menu request 603. In response to the menu request 603, the file server 110 transmits a menu to the file requesting client 120 by a menu transmission 604. Here, the menu is given as home pages available at the file server 110 or pages that can be reached by tracing links from these home pages. When the user selects a desired file from the menu, and a file list request 605 for the selected file is sent to the file server 110. At the file server 110, when the file list request 605 from the file requesting client 120 is received, the file list corresponding to the selected file is sent to the file requesting client 120 by a file list transmission 606.” (column 8, lines 40-55)

Even if one were to combine the teachings of *Stedman et al.* and *Imai et al.*, the combination still fails to teach or suggest the present invention as the combination merely results in a network connection used for transferring a list of files wherein the network connection is associated with a session ID identifying the network connection. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1.

Relative to independent claim 2, the above arguments relative to independent claim 1 are also applicable to independent claim 2, and Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 2.

Relative to dependent claims 3-8, these dependent claims depend from independent claim 2. Since these dependent claims depend from independent claim 2, and Applicant believes he has successfully traversed the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 2, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 3-8.


Prior Art Made of Record and Not Relied Upon

Applicant has reviewed the prior art made of record and not relied upon considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure, and these fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Brent C. Hawke

By: 
Prentiss Wayne Johnson, Reg. No. 33,123
Attorney for Applicant
IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
555 Bailey Avenue, J46/G467
San Jose, CA 95141-9989
Telephone: (408) 463-5673

Date: August 7, 2003